

# The American Catholic Sociological Review

---



---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

What Constitutes a Sociology of Religion? . . . . .	147
<i>Franz H. Mueller</i>	
The Central-Verein, a Non-Institutional Social Control . . . . .	153
<i>Sister Mary Liguori, B.V.M.</i>	
A Catholic Approach to Anthropology . . . . .	159
<i>Albert Muntzsch, S.J.</i>	
Methods of Procedure in Securing Distributive Justice . . . . .	166
<i>Eligius Weir, O.F.M.</i>	
Undergraduate Preparation for Social Work . . . . .	171
<i>Sister Elizabeth Frances</i>	
News of Sociological Interest . . . . .	176
Book Reviews . . . . .	180



OCTOBER, 1941

# **FOURTH ANNUAL CONVENTION**

of

**The American Catholic Sociological Society**

DECEMBER 28, 29, 30

Hotel Astor, New York, N. Y.

---

***Topics for Discussion:***

Rural Sociology  
Sociology and Public Welfare  
Criminology  
The Family in Contemporary Society  
Race and Race Relations  
Social Processes and Sociology  
Contemporary Research in Sociology  
Labor Problems  
Social Theory  
Contemporary Social Movements  
Curriculum and Content of College Sociology  
Sociology in the High School

***Also***

Round Table Discussions  
Special Student Session

✕

*Outstanding leaders in the field of sociology and Catholic social thought will discuss these topics*

✕

**PLEASE POST**

*Mail Reservations to Hotel Astor*







# The American Catholic Sociological Review

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

What Constitutes a Sociology of Religion? .....	147
<i>Franz H. Mueller</i>	
The Central-Verein, a Non-Institutional Social Control .....	153
<i>Sister Mary Liguori, B.V.M.</i>	
A Catholic Approach to Anthropology .....	159
<i>Albert Muntsch, S.J.</i>	
Methods of Procedure in Securing Distributive Justice .....	166
<i>Eligius Weir, O.F.M.</i>	
Undergraduate Preparation for Social Work .....	171
<i>Sister Elizabeth Frances</i>	
News of Sociological Interest .....	176
Book Reviews .....	180

---

Current and back issues of THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW are indexed in the *Catholic Periodical Index*.

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW is published quarterly during the months of March, June, October, and December, by the American Catholic Sociological Society. The REVIEW is sent without additional charge to all members. Subscription price for non-members is \$2 a year.

Address all communications and subscriptions to:

AMERICAN CATHOLIC SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW  
Loyola University, 6525 Sheridan Rd., Chicago, Illinois

## EDITORIAL BOARD

REV. RALPH A. GALLAGHER, S.J.  
*Loyola University, Chicago, Ill.*

SISTER ANNE, O.S.B.  
*College of St. Benedict, St. Joseph, Minn.*

ARTHUR T. DONOHUE  
*Loyola University, New Orleans, La.*

SISTER ELIZABETH FRANCES, S.S.J.  
*Regis College, Weston, Mass.*

GEORGE FITZGIBBON  
*Boston College, Chestnut Hill, Mass.*

FRANK T. FLYNN  
*University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Ind.*

REV. PAUL HANLY FURFEY  
*Catholic University, Washington, D. C.*

PAUL J. MUNDIE  
*Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wis.*

FRANZ MUELLER  
*College of St. Thomas, St. Paul, Minn.*

REV. LEO ROBINSON, S.J.  
*Gonzaga University, Spokane, Washington*

EVA J. ROSS  
*Trinity College, Washington, D. C.*

HELEN M. TOOLE  
*College of New Rochelle, New Rochelle, N. Y.*

## What Constitutes a Sociology of Religion?

FRANZ H. MUELLER

Social life may be scientifically considered from three viewpoints, from the theological, the philosophical, and the empirical, and of these three the last is obviously proper to sociology. Sociology proper therefore is neither intended nor equipped to treat of the supernatural basis of interhuman relations and structures or their natural created essences. And this applies also to the sociology of religion, which is not an autonomous and independent science but only a branch of what has been called "cultural sociology" as distinguished from "general sociology" on the one hand and "bio-sociology" on the other. This cultural sociology — which is not to be confused with the "cultural approach" — studies the social phenomena typical for each department of human culture and civilization (knowledge, economics, politics, law, art, etc.). It avails itself of the so-called "ideal types" of social integration and disintegration, i. e., those heuristic categories developed and systematized in general sociology. If in this instance we speak of religion as a cultural phenomenon and, therefore, one of the "human achievements," we do *not* wish to represent it as something entirely man-made, perhaps as a form or result of "man's adaptation to his environment," as many of our modern, mostly positivist, sociologists do. Religion does *not*, as W. G. Sumner asserted, "come out of the *mores*." Religion is *not* a mere "social heritage," a "condition of social accommodation" or a specific variation of the "objectivized mind" of man. Religion, as the bond which by means of knowledge, worship, devotion, and service unites men to God, is not, however, a *purely* supernatural phenomenon either. Man is able to express his relationship to God only in a natural, human way. And God Himself when He deals with men accommodates Himself, so to speak, to the earthly manner of man's existence. Except in the case of miracles, God makes use of the so-called *causae secundae*. As St. Thomas Aquinas says, God, the First Cause, in His transcendent goodness, gives created beings not only their being, but also their causal being. In other words: creatures conform to their natures in the manner of their existence and to the laws imprinted on them by the Creator. Creatures therefore possess a relative autonomy, and this autonomy in the case of man endowed with intellect and free will is

especially articulate. Within the framework of his nature he is free and even "creative" in an analogous sense. This is also true of man's relationship to God. In the manner in which he comes to know God, the manner in which he serves Him, obeys Him, and worships Him, man possesses a certain latitude and freedom provided only that he attains his goal. According to the Catholic concept it is the Church that prescribes the limits of this freedom, and in this respect the Church is more "liberal" than are the sects. Proclaiming the principle: *gratia supponit naturam*, grace builds on nature, the Church allows great freedom for the expression of national and personal characteristics. We may recall here the rich variation among the religious communities of women and men approved by the Church, the great diversity of the Canon Law, and the various liturgical rites in the Eastern branches of the Roman Church.

It is in *this* human, created aspect of religion that sociology applies and functions. From among the natural, empirical phases of religion, sociology selects the social phase. Since man, as we know from experience, is a social being, also his relations with God and the supernatural take on social forms. The sociology of religion, however, does not treat only of the immediate and proximate social expressions of religion, i. e., religious interhuman relationships and structures, but also of the remoter social effects of religion, i. e., its influence on social life as a whole as well as the influence social conditions exercise upon the formation and the character of religious association and dissociation.

It has been repeatedly stated that the subject matter of the sociology of religion is the mutual relations between religion and society, and thus the influence of social factors on religion itself is included. It appears, however, that sociology strictly as sociology can treat of the relations between men and also between individuals and social wholes and structures, but not the relation between God and man. As an empirical science it is entirely inadequate to interpret the essentially transcendental, aprioristic, and normative elements of religion to the human intellect. The realm of grace, that supernatural, sacramental sphere of religion, is entirely beyond the reach of the methods and categories of sociology proper. It cannot therefore ever hope to supplant theology.<sup>1</sup> Nor can sociology be regarded as a pragmatic

<sup>1</sup> In an article, "The Sociological Significance of the Bible" (*American Journal of Sociology*; Vol. XII, n. 4, p. 532), L. Wallis says rightly: "The sociological investigator is merely a scientist; and science cannot have the final word on the deeper problems of life."

study that might define and interpret religion in terms of its possible practical significance for society, especially of its suitability for social progress and as a unifying factor in society. It studies the "is," and the "is to be" only in so far as it actually affects the "is". It is always an indication of a fundamental misconception of the nature of religion when sociologists feel themselves called on to reform religious institutions, as, e. g., the Church, or when sociology is even offered as an "up-to-date" substitute for religion. Of course, those who look upon religion as merely a kind of social ethics embroidered with fanciful myths are anxious to replace these "myths" with what they call "solid science." We may recall that some prominent sociologists have demanded that religion adapt itself to the two outstanding facts of modern civilization, science and democracy, and that it present a "more rationalized and socialized form of the religion of Jesus."<sup>2</sup> Others have proposed that sociology "make practicably available to the leaders of the churches . . . the sociological technique of organization and the engineering of human forces."<sup>3</sup> Though sociology is surely not an art, or a science that teaches social engineering, no one will deny that ministers of religion could and should benefit from the actual findings of sociology. The Church has always, and rather ably and profitably so, exploited nature and especially the social nature of man. In relying on the Holy Spirit, the Church relies on the spirit of knowledge, and thus has no reason to reject the aid of true science but welcomes it. The papal encyclicals on the social question, emphasizing the necessity of a sound social order as the basis for a healthy religious life and demanding a study of the problems relating to this viewpoint, are evidence that the Church acknowledges the assistance of science. Furthermore, the existence of organizations in this country such as, the Catholic Rural Life Conference, the Catholic Conference on Industrial Problems, the National Catholic Social Action Congresses, the Committee on Social Studies of the National Catholic Educational Association, etc., shows that the Church is fully aware of the necessity of studying modern social problems in relation to religion. We must, however, not overlook the fact that we have here a study of social problems from a moral and sometimes from a religious viewpoint, and specifically, not a

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Ch. A. Ellwood, *Papers and Proceedings of the American Sociological Society*, Chicago, 1920, Vol. XIV, p. 127; also E. A. Ross, *ibid.*, p. 133.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. E. L. Earp, *Papers and Proceedings etc.*, Vol. XV, 1921, p. 82.

sociological analysis of religion or even any attempt to "socialize" religion and make it more "progressive."

It may be mentioned briefly here that the social aspect of religion still waits for its integration into a distinct body of knowledge. Even Catholics have, in post-Tridentine times, somewhat neglected the specifically *religious* concept of social phenomena and, it is true, in favor of a predominantly *ethical* approach to the matter. Today we occasionally find efforts being made to gather together into what might be called social theology or sacred sociology<sup>4</sup> such subjects as the social significance of the Trinity, the social aspect of the fall and redemption of man, the Church as the mystical body of Christ, the communion of saints, and the kingdom of God.<sup>5</sup> This theological or supernatural sociology which is founded on the creed and on supernatural revelation must, however, not be confused with our present subject of the sociology of religion.

The sociology of religion must be content with being an empirical science. It should not attempt "to understand religion by deriving it from elements not in themselves religious" (G. Simmel). The subject matter it treats of is no different than that of sociology in general, except that it is restricted to and concentrates on those empirically accessible phenomena that have some relation to religion. It inquires into the influence that religious creeds and attitudes have on interhuman relations, whether these creeds have a uniting or dispersing effect, and in what way, whether and to what extent these creeds determine or influence the specific character of social relations and structures. It investigates further into the matter of how spatial and historical circumstances individuate (affect) religious associations in the broad sense. Experience teaches us that historical, ecological, and ethnical data, those secondary or material causes mentioned above, are able to shape, mold, obstruct and further the outward form, configuration, features of religious communities — but not their "souls"

<sup>4</sup> Since the term "sociology" should be used only to signify *empirical social studies*, it is to be admitted that words like "sacred," "theological" or "supernatural sociology" are less desirable than "social theology," provided the latter is not mistaken for moral theology or moral philosophy. "Supernatural Sociology," if this term be used at all, is not, as E. J. Ross seems to assume (*Cf. The American Catholic Sociological Review*, Vol. II, No. 2), identical with the "postulates" of sociology proper. The so-called postulates contain much matter that is neither "supernatural" nor "social" in nature.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. the articles by Rev. P. H. Furfey and myself, in Nos. 4 and 3 respectively of Vol. I of *The American Catholic Sociological Review*.

— in the way that catalyzers and anticatalysts act and react. Here is the field and sphere of the sociology of religion. Its subject matter still remains the factors and phenomena of integration and disintegration, but not the factors and phenomena of moral and specifically religious being. The sociology of religion may enter the service of social reform and social "engineering," but it is not identical with these things. In answer to the question, What constitutes a sociology of religion, we say that it is the study, the science, of the social effects and of the various social expressions of religion, as well as the investigation of the factors that exercise an influence on religious associations.

The result of our reflections may be summarized in the following theses:

- (1) Sociology *qua* sociology studies *social* phenomena; this applies also to a *sociology* of religion.
- (2) Religion is *not* a purely social phenomenon; it is the bond which by means of knowledge, worship, devotion and service unites men to God (supernature).
- (3) Sociology, therefore, *cannot* explain the whole and the essential reasons of religious phenomena. Inadequate to set forth the essential issues of religious life, sociology should not attempt to take the place of theology (pseudo-theology).
- (4) Religion "springs from the whole nature of man" (Ellwood) whose spiritual (rational) soul forms the link to supernature; it follows from a consideration of his origin and final end.
- (5) Religion is, therefore, not a purely supernatural or spiritual phenomenon. As a relationship between God and man it has also human aspects and empirical features.
- (6) Man is a social being. Men realize God as their *common* origin and end. They join and separate for the sake of God and salvation. Thus the religious nature of man manifests itself in (positive or negative) social forms.
- (7) The social manifestations of the religious nature or life of man are individuated through manifold circumstances. Historical, ethnic, spatial factors etc. do not cause but influence the empirical development and existence of religious association and dissociation (human interaction).
- (8) While sociology (of religion) as an empirical science has no direct access to the religious *nature* of man, which is a spiritual phenomenon, it can and should study the *social manifestations* of the religious nature of man in time and space, especially the secondary ("material," instrumental,



proximate) "causes" of religious association and dissociation.

- (9) The study of the social manifestations of religious life and thought may concern itself with:
  - a. secular (non-religious) social life as influenced or individuated by religious ethos, attitudes, mentality;
  - b. religious association and dissociation influenced by extra-religious data.
- (10) The dignity of religion is not endangered if the sociologist studies and analyzes the influence of attitudes (subjective motives = *finis operantis*) and situations which provide the natural bases for supernatural life. Even the imperfect phases of the human "wish for security" may serve as a preliminary step towards a nobler ethos of salvation. Pastoral theology and ministry will benefit from a sociological study of the natural and human factors in religious life.

#### Some literature on problems of sociology of religion:

- R. H. Tawney, *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism*, London, 1926.  
 A. Fanfani, *Catholicism, Protestantism and Capitalism*, London, 1935.  
 G. O'Brien, *An Essay on the Economic Effects of the Reformation*, London, 1923.  
 W. Sombart, *The Quintessence of Capitalism*, London, 1915.  
 G. Jellinek, *The Declaration of the Rights of Man and of Citizens*, New York, 1901.  
 J. B. Kraus, S.J., *Scholastik, Puritanismus und Kapitalismus*, Munich, 1930.  
 Max Weber, *The Protestant Ethics and the Spirit of Capitalism*, London, 1930.  
 W. Schmidt, *Origin and Growth of Religion*, 1931.  
 F. v. Huegel, *The German Soul*, London, 1916.  
 E. Troeltsch, *Social Teachings of the Christian Churches*, London, 1931.  
 W. Sombart, *The Jews and Modern Capitalism*, London, 1913.  
 R. Grünwald, *Das Problem der Soziologie der Wissens*, Wien, 1934.  
 J. Hasenfuss, *Die moderne Religionssoziologie*, Paderborn, 1937.  
 P. Honigsheim, *An Outline for the Study of Sociology of Religion . . . East Lansing, Mich.*, 1940.  
 W. Schmidt, *Primitive Revelation*, St. Louis, Mo., 1939.  
 J. Brodrick, S.J., *The Economic Morals of the Jesuits*, Oxford, 1934.  
 H. M. Robertson, *Aspects of the Rise of Economic Individualism*, 1933.  
 H. Becker and H. Barnes, *Social Thought from Lore to Science*, 1938.  
 G. Gundlach, S.J., *Zur Soziologie der katholischen Ideenwelt und des Jesuitenordens*, Freiburg i. B., 1927.  
 Cf. index of the *American Journal of Sociology* and *Papers and Proceedings of the American Sociol. Society*; espec. the articles and papers by A. E. Holt, H. W. Niebuhr, A. L. Swift, H. H. Maurer, E. Faris, J. D. Stoops.



## **The Central-Verein, a Non-Institutional Social Control**

SISTER MARY LIGUORI, B.V.M.

One of the news reels recently featured a German settlement in Brazil which has successfully resisted assimilation by the Portuguese dominants and retained, over some three or four generations, old German customs and language. There would be very interesting data in that phenomenon for the ethnologist, and an equally interesting comparison might be made between these people and the Germans who came in veritable waves of immigration to the United States during the 1800's. By 1855 the number of Catholic Germans who had come here was considerable, and in the larger cities they had formed parishes of their own in which their own language was exclusively used. Many of these parishes could boast of various organizations of different sex or age groups and most of the married men's societies made provisions for the care of sick or needy members. In some cases a rather elaborate insurance society had been developed, although, of course, on a very small scale.

In the year 1855, an inter-parish function in honor of a Redemptorist who had been transferred to another parish was held. Representatives from German parishes of both Rochester and Buffalo were present. Someone proposed a union of the societies in the Buffalo diocese, and when the plan was submitted to Bishop John Timon, he assented with the reservation that the work be promoted by laymen only, in order to avoid Know-Nothing opposition as far as possible. The German Catholics were targets for the Know-Nothing patriots on two grounds, that is, nationality and religion. The non-sectarian German "Bund" was formed in this period to defend nationality interests, but as in the case of so many "non-sectarian" groups, the basis of union was definitely, though not ostensibly, hostility to the Catholic Church and admittedly, the union aimed at the protection of the mutual interests against supra-patriotic encroachments. With the Bund, the Catholic Germans would have nothing to do. The German Roman Catholics called their organization the "Central-Verein" and it grew primarily as a benevolent society for the first

fifty years of its existence. Toward the end of that period, it was becoming more and more obvious that insurance societies must capitulate to the large insurance companies which operated on a sound scientific actuarial basis, so the Central-Verein simply divested itself of the insurance feature, and concentrated its attention on its mission as propagator and interpreter of Catholic social doctrine to the American public.<sup>1</sup> After 86 years of existence, this is its chief function today, that is, to unite German Catholics, to educate and strengthen them in their knowledge and appreciation of their Faith and heritage, and to encourage them to spread their priceless gift.

The Central-Verein is an interesting social phenomenon from several angles. Its growth kept pace with the influx of Germans into the United States, and very naturally its hold on its membership was strongest and the members' dependence on it was greatest during their early days in this country. Doubtless many of the founders of the society envisioned a strong, compact German society within the political boundaries of the United States, a group impervious to the demands to modify customs in conformity with the dominant Anglo-American society. From the first meeting in Baltimore in 1855, to which 17 societies sent delegates, it was apparent that the federation of these societies was highly desirable. Ten years after the first meeting, 55 societies were members, and by its 25th year, 328 societies had become affiliated with it. This number increased to almost a thousand in the next 25 years. Then the revision in its plan of membership made the Central Society a union of state leagues, a form which it retains at the present time.

At its inception and very notably in its early years, the organization was encouraged by priests who saw in it a means of combating "secret societies." Secret societies of a violent anti-Catholic character were bidding for the support of German-speaking Americans, the very notorious Knights of Hermann being the particular aversion of the clergy. Another encouragement to clerical support for the Central-Verein was the circumstance that the federation tended to dispel the trustee idea, that peculiar perversion of Americanism which captivated the earlier immigrants and caused so much disturbance in the

<sup>1</sup> *Proceedings of the Annual Conventions, 1855-1941*. The minutes of the first ten meetings are available in manuscript in the Central Bureau Library in St. Louis, as are also the printed Proceedings of subsequent years. Mullen Library at the Catholic University possesses many of the older volumes as well as all those of recent years. There is valuable information in the special Souvenir books prepared for landmark conventions.

early  
there  
trust  
the p  
had  
selve  
tion o

D  
articu  
liam  
porte  
men o  
and o  
is not  
25 ye  
one o  
fitting  
memb  
tude o  
insiste  
lic tea  
his ex  
these  
strate  
the el  
grams  
withst  
the er  
crystal  
likent  
Volksw  
which  
States.

<sup>2</sup> B  
in Mull  
Reform  
viously  
XLVI

<sup>3</sup> A  
of Hein  
on this

early American dioceses. At the time the Central-Verein was formed, there was in the city of Buffalo one German parish in which the trustee system had secured a hold, to the serious detriment of both the parishioners and the pastor. From its very beginning the Verein had the support of the clergy and when the German priests themselves formed a "Priester-Verein," the concerted aid of this organization encouraged the Central-Verein to wider activity in the social field.

During this period in Germany, Catholicism itself had become articulate in the persons of many a great leader, notably, Bishop William Emmanuel Baron von Ketteler,<sup>2</sup> whom Pope Leo XIII is reported to have acclaimed as his great predecessor, and the famous laymen of the Center Party, Windthorst, Lieber, Reichensperger, Weber, and others.<sup>3</sup> Whatever be the explanation, however, von Ketteler is not mentioned by name in the proceedings of the society until some 25 years after his death, and then by Bishop Spalding rather than by one of the Verein members. The centenary of his birth in 1911 was fittingly observed, but the studied indifference to him by the earlier members is somewhat of a mystery. Von Ketteler deserves the gratitude of the Catholic world, and indeed of the whole world, for his insistence on the social mission of the Church, his emphasis on Catholic teachings which would offset both Communism and Liberalism, his exposition of Catholic principles which weighed the tenets of both these political doctrines in the scales of revealed truth and demonstrated their inherent error. Catholic Germany, stirred to action by the eloquence of the Bishop of Mainz, inspired by his pungent epigrams, produced many other spokesmen, warriors who valiantly withstood the encroachments of the Bismarck government and resisted the enticements of smouldering Communism. Catholic activity crystallized in such manifestations as the Catholic Congresses, Katholikentage, and Volksverein, and the permanent secretariat of the Volksverein at München-Gladbach. Such was the social heritage which the later German Catholic immigration brought to the United States.

<sup>2</sup> Bishop von Ketteler's *Sechs Predigten* of 1848 are available in pamphlet in Mullen Library, and translated partially in George Metlake's *Christian Social Reform*, Dolphin Press, 1912. This book is now out of print. Much of it had previously been published in the *Ecclesiastical Review*, Vol. XLV (1911), and Vol. XLVI (1912).

<sup>3</sup> A definite program, *Christian Solidarism*, finally emanated from the brain of Heinrich Pesch, S.J. Franz H. Mueller has published an interesting booklet on this "precursor of corporatism."

Probably at the outset the open meetings were planned as much for advertising the Verein as for the promotion of Catholic doctrine. Each annual convention was, however, conducted in a manner befitting a society exclusively of Catholics from its opening with Solemn High Mass to its final closing *mit Gebet*. When the Priester-Verein had been organized, the efforts to spread Catholic social doctrine were somewhat more marked and an effort was made to reproduce in this country the Katholikentage of Germany. Circumstances tended to discourage the German priests' organization which expired after a short life of about a decade, and with its demise the Katholikentage expired also. In the meantime, from Rome itself had come pronouncements which set the seal of approval on the efforts to restore in the temporal order the Christian way of life. From the issuance of *Rerum Novarum* in 1891 until the death of Pope Leo, the social policies of the Verein were gradually formulating. Again and again speakers urged the intelligent use of our republican institutions to bring about a Christian social order. It was to effect better this purpose that the state leagues were formed to keep vigilant eye on legislation and to bring about the passage of laws in accordance with this avowed purpose.

It is interesting to trace the gradual triumph of the "missionary" idea in this organization. In the early years it is all too apparent that the preservation of the native language and customs was the principal objective. Then open meetings, parades, considerable fanfare and display bespeak an effort of adolescent self-consciousness and desire for social approval. The next factor whose influence is felt in the society is the success — or at least the attractiveness — of the Catholic social program in Germany and the approval the great pronouncements of Pope Leo gave to the principles enunciated in Germany. The Papal encyclicals received considerable attention and were the theme of many a German speech during the decade following *Rerum Novarum*. Then it was deemed advisable to launch an official organ, *Central-Blatt and Social Justice*, a half-English monthly which in the course of years lost most of its German and in 1940 became the *Social Justice Review*. The magazine adopted the English language with greater facility than did the Verein itself.

By the time of the first World War the organization was prepared to undertake, through its Central Bureau in St. Louis, the co-operative idea, the maternity guild device, and other palliatives, mean-

while  
Cath  
way  
I  
achie  
give  
immi  
a rap  
effort  
it is r  
with  
speak  
amon  
count  
ever,  
situat  
larger  
from  
may b  
Germa  
by th  
great  
very f  
Kettel  
ciated.  
for th  
Catho  
Verein  
while  
the ill  
resist a  
were t  
this gu  
Centra  
United  
doctrin  
quency  
Centra  
us with  
the So

while promoting with indefatigable zeal the social doctrine of the Catholic Church, and working for a restoration of the Christian way of life.

It would be naïve in the extreme to blind oneself to all but the achievements of this admirably organized society. While one must give it due credit for the rôle it undoubtedly played in aiding the immigrants to adjust themselves to conditions here and in preventing a rapid and undesirable social disintegration among them, while its efforts for the maintenance of parish schools are not but to be blessed, it is regrettable that the organization was so slow to implement itself with a tool which would convey its social doctrines to the English-speaking American public. Probably none but the most unrealistic among them ever actually hoped for an intact German society in this country similar to the isolated group in Brazil. There seems, however, to be an early failure to appreciate the demands of the social situation, to convey its message in a language which would reach the larger American society. Much of the leadership in the Verein came from editors of German Catholic magazines and newspapers. This may be an explanation. Whatever be the fact, the naturalism of the German savants was being effectively diffused through this country by the University group, but the social doctrines of Germany's great Catholic leaders were buried in tomes inaccessible to all but a very few of American Catholic leaders. To this day, Bishop von Ketteler is too little known; Pesch, Cathrein, and others unappreciated. Perhaps the Central-Verein is not to be too severely castigated for this apparent neglect. From the standpoint of the American Catholic it is easy to see and condemn it, but in the rank and file of Verein membership there doubtless was no consciousness of the duty, while in the leadership there were probably many who cherished the illusion that German language and customs could successfully resist assimilation by the English-speaking group, that their treasures were to be jealously guarded and, further, that the responsibility for this guardianship devolved on them. Too reluctantly, then, did the Central-Verein, the federation of German Catholic societies of the United States, undertake to divulge to the American public the social doctrine of the Catholic Church. In a measure, however, its delinquency has been atoned for in the tireless zeal of the promoters of the Central Bureau who have for the last thirty years or more furnished us with one of the better type of news commentaries, now known as the *Social Justice Review*, and whose invaluable library, a priceless

collection of German Americana and volumes on social science, is available to all who wish to use it. The Central Bureau is one of the earliest sources of pamphlets on subjects of interest to Catholics, and through this service has promoted study courses, lectures and the like. One cannot but admire the effectiveness with which it has sought to realize the ambition of the saintly Pope Pius X to restore all things in Christ. In a word, during the period of its existence, the German Roman Catholic Central-Verein has lost most of its "German," and emphasized more and more its "Catholic" character.

★

★

★

T  
them  
to th  
scien  
facts  
thes  
mate  
V

Is it  
preci

of w  
adap  
and  
are t

objec  
three  
Stars  
tiona  
to m  
of na

I  
creat  
wrot  
the l  
are s  
num  
of ch  
and  
dict  
of th  
V  
wish

## A Catholic Approach to Anthropology

ALBERT MUNTSCH, S.J.

The first question that naturally arises in a consideration of this theme is whether it is at all practical to speak of a *Catholic* approach to the study of the racial and cultural history of man. We say that science is impersonal, that it is based on the careful observation of facts, on the exact knowledge of laws derived from a correlation of these facts, and on the ever widening understanding of their proximate causes.

We do not speak of a Catholic astronomy, botany or chemistry. Is it equally untenable to speak of a Catholic anthropology or, more precisely, a Catholic approach to the subject?

The answer to this question must be based on our understanding of what and who is "man," whose ways and works, whose various adaptations to environment, whose attitudes towards God and nature, and whose failures and triumphs in the upbuilding of his culture, are the subject matter of anthropology.

There can hardly be difference of opinion as to the nature of the objects, facts and processes that constitute the realm of inquiry of the three sciences just mentioned — astronomy, botany and chemistry. Stars and planets, trees and ferns, hydrogen and oxygen are international concepts and the devotees of these several sciences find it easy to maintain objective poise in their scientific study of these aspects of nature.

But not all scientists are at one in their attitude towards "this creature man." La Mettrie, one of the earlier French materialists, wrote his *L'homme Machine* (Man, a Machine) in 1748. He was the leader of French materialism in its most extreme form, but there are students of the science of man today who are not averse to being numbered in that school. According to others man is only a bundle of chemical elements set in motion by physical forces whose reactions and attitudes, and even whose faith and moral conduct, can be predicted with almost mathematical precision according to the formulae of the behaviorists.

We reject these two vagaries of modern thought and do not even wish to be identified with any group that leans towards either of



these schools which rob man of his free will and of his first place in creation.

Perhaps some are beginning to suspect that after all a Catholic attitude toward some of the basic problems of anthropology seems justified. For "the proper study of mankind is man"; and the proper study of anthropology is man. But how can that study be "properly" pursued if those who engage in it begin with false notions about "man," the very subject matter of their study? We define man as "animal rationale," possessing free will and faculties which are not found in the brute world. We deny that he is a "machine" whether in the sense of La Mettrie or of Watson and his behaviorist disciples. Evidently the view of man accepted in Catholic philosophy will influence our approach to a study of his culture, language, religion, mythology, folklore, and all the other traits and complexes that set off one group or tribe from another.

Let us compare, for instance, the respective attitudes of a Professor Leuba and of a Father Schmidt when confronted by a solid array of facts pointing to a widespread primitive monotheism. Which of the two investigators is in a better position to appraise these facts at their proper value? Whose approach commends itself more readily to the unbiased mind? Is it that of the Bryn Mawr psychologist or that of the theologian and lifelong student of primitive religion and mythology? It is true, of course, that both scholars have, if you will, preconceptions. But we are aware too that the presuppositions in one case are rational and that in the other they are based on an unreasonable hostility towards the very idea of a spiritual world.

Students of anthropology are familiar with the stupendous mass of data on primitive superstitions gathered from every corner of the earth and deposited in the twelve bulky tomes of Frazer's *Golden Bough*. We possess also a somewhat similar work, on a smaller scale, by an American sociologist — *Folkways*, by W. G. Sumner, of Yale. Finally, we have the impressive array of facts and theories by Robert Briffault in his three-volume work — *The Mothers*.

Most anthropologists while admitting the facts presented by Frazer and Briffault do not subscribe to their conclusions. It is significant that in the publisher's circular on Briffault's book not one leading anthropologist is mentioned. The encomiums were written by the Professional reviewers of some of the leading dailies and weeklies.



It seems at least clear that there is an approach to anthropological investigation which is not Catholic. Frazer himself candidly admits his viewpoint or "approach" in the Preface to Part II of the *Golden Bough*, where he says: "that the ethical, like the legal code of a people, stands in need of constant revision will hardly be disputed by any attentive and dispassionate observer. The old view that the principles of right and wrong are immutable and eternal is no longer tenable. The moral law is as little exempt as the physical world from the law of ceaseless change, or perpetual flux." This is a brave confession of Frazer's faith as well as a clarification of his "approach."

Briffault holds that "taboos on sexual morality" have been the leading social control in primitive society and, like Frazer, he thinks that our morals have "developed" from a strange past.

That a "Catholic approach" is more reasonable than that of the two authors just referred to is evident from the fact that severest strictures have been meted out to Frazer, Briffault, Herbert Spencer, L. H. Morgan and other "evolutionists," by the leading exponents of the science, and not to Catholic representatives of the science like Fathers Schmidt, Pinard de la Boullaye, Von Bulck, Koppers, Gundersin and others. It is true that Schmidt and his school have been at times harshly criticized for their "Kulturkreistheorie," but this theory is as innocent of a Catholic background as is a proposition of Euclid.

I shall cite only one criticism, from the *Nation* (Volume 109, Number 2826) because it applies so well to many theorizers in the field of primitive culture. Professor G. Eliot Smith is an English biologist who ventured into the larger field of anthropology. He wrote, *The Evolution of Man* (in which he expounds his Darwinian philosophy), *The Migration of Early Culture* in which he holds that all culture diffused from Egypt), and numerous other anthropological works.

The criticism referred to was made by a reviewer of one of Smith's works. We read:

"For difficult explanation of easy things and for easy explanation of difficult things; for the construction of total theories on the foundation of single fragments of evidence; for the transformation of hypothesis into fact at the call of convenience; for detecting essential and significant relationships in merest accidental resemblance; for overdriving and overshooting, and for 'seeing things' in general, the science of anthropology, or ethnology, or

comparative mythology or religion — whichever we wish to call study of this kind — has established a reputation second to none."

Catholic students of anthropology may have erred occasionally in drawing far-reaching conclusions from an insignificant body of facts, or in failing to give weight to data contrary to their thesis. But the sciolists condemned by the reviewer in the *Nation* are not in the Catholic camp.

It is not in keeping with the traditions of sound scholarship to strengthen an argument by appeal to a humorous screed. But in 1918 there was published a booklet under the title *Anthropology Up-to-date*. The author is George Winter Mitchell, Professor of Classics, Queen's University, Kingston, Canada. In this work it is precisely the naïve, unscientific "approach" of some of the devotees of anthropology which is castigated. J. G. Frazer, James Leuba, W. G. Sumner, Herbert Spencer are some of the notables cited — but never "cum laude." They are instanced as purveyors of anthropological balderdash. The wise, conservative Catholic principles which, for example, have held fast to the story of man's creation as told in *Genesis* have preserved Catholic students from representation in this anthropological rogues' gallery.

But the cry may be raised: "What about academic freedom?" Does not the Catholic approach put heavy shackles upon the student of primitive religion, of primitive culture, and of man's checkered progress through the ages? Let us be patient. What are some of the substantial gains of anthropological science during the last three decades? You will find that they are all in harmony with Catholic thought in exegesis, philosophy, and ethics.

This is a large assertion. Yet it is true that some of these lasting gains were achieved not only by careful, persistent work in the field but also by admitting, no doubt unconsciously, certain tenets concerning man and his position in the cosmos, which have never been abandoned in Catholic apologetics. Of course, there was not the least intention on the part of these field workers to hold to these tenets. Unwittingly, however, they strengthened our position. The Catholic approach, therefore, needs no far-fetched and verbose justification, judging from these well-established conclusions.

I shall list only those gains that are now accepted by the vast majority of anthropologists.

In the first place, the science has shown that (whatever may be said about *biologic* evolution — the theory as to the origin of man's body) there certainly has been no *cultural* evolution. That is, there has been no gradual upward development in man's mental and psychic life. When we first meet man, we find him possessed of religion, morality, language, family-life, private property, etc.

This fact is of importance, since we hold that Adam, the first man and father of the human race, was made by God in His own image. He and his immediate posterity did not "evolve" gradually out of an irrational, brutelike condition.

Anthropology asserts the physical and psychical unity of man. Though there may be five (or more or fewer) races from the standpoint of hereditary traits, like color, skeletal structure, kind of hair, etc., mankind is somatically *one*. Psychic unity implies essential similarity as far as mental life and power of abstraction are concerned. It is needless to stress the bearing of this fact upon the dogma of universal Redemption and the spirituality of the human soul.

A still more significant gain — significant both for anthropology and apologetics — is the establishment of primitive monotheism. Instead of a long, painful upward climb of the lower races out of animism, fetishism, ancestor worship and polytheism, we find that the most primitive people had a belief in one God. Quite often there was "devolution" instead of "evolution" of the idea of a Supreme Being. In fact, it has been shown that groups of very low material culture had a higher idea of God than sophisticated peoples of advanced civilization.

A favorite theory of the "evolutionary school" of culture is (was) that of "primitive promiscuity." Isolated cases of unregulated sex life could certainly be found in primitive life. These were made to serve as their basis for a "gradual evolution" towards monogamy. Anthropology rejects the theory. For just as this science has established the fact of primitive monotheism, so too has it found evidence of a well-regulated family life, and of monogamy in primitive society.

"Lawless savage" is a phrase met with in the Sunday supplement of papers which occasionally make an excursion to the lands of the primitives. The insinuation is that the latter had neither law nor ethics nor morality. Close study of their lives has shown that the opinion is without foundation. In this respect, too, very backward people, like the Pygmies of Africa and the Indians of Tierra del Fuego (South America), rate rather high. They have rigid moral codes,

punish offenses against them (sometimes more rigidly than civilized man), and even offer expiatory sacrifice to the Deity for offenses.

Is there anything like social and community organization in primitive society? Anthropology answers "yes." Instead of finding hordes that recognize no bonds of solidarity or kinship we find closely organized divisions, like clans, gentes, totemic groups, tribes, etc., in other words, submission to tribal rules and regulations. The theory of some socialist writers that government is the result of a long evolutionary process is rejected by anthropology.

Followers of Engel and Bebel and other "evolutionists" held that private property was not tolerated among the lower races. The opinion can no longer be maintained. Not to speak of the summary rejection of that theory of Lowie and other American anthropologists, Father Schmidt has presented facts in three scholarly volumes establishing the existence of private property in every area of the primitive world.

Finally, the science of man has put the quietus on theories which have done much to foster racial hatred and prejudice. I refer to the unsound opinion that there are biologically "superior races." Anthropologists deserve credit for exploding the "myth of Nordic superiority."

These, I say, are substantial gains. They will be of immense use to Catholic sociologists in courses on social origins, theories of social institutions, as well as to our teachers of social ethics, who treat of marriage and the family, the *state* and *private property*. These well-established conclusions amply justify the Catholic approach to the subject. But I would add that the approach should be both Catholic, and catholic. It should be Catholic, that is, in harmony with the principles of philosophy and exegesis always maintained by the Church; it should be catholic, that is, it should give generous recognition to all well-established facts, no matter by whom they are presented, and look upon all sincere students of man as co-workers in the great task of building up and extending that discipline whose devotees can truly say, "*Homo sum; humani nil a me alienum puto.*"

I just referred to the need of our approach being in harmony with Catholic exegesis. Has the Church then issued any norms for our guidance? Most assuredly. The revelations in the opening chapters of Genesis are not necessarily truths that can be appraised by scientific methods which appeal to human reason engaged in the study of nature. Nevertheless, the Church fully cognizant of this

mystery watches with care over the deposit of Divine Revelation. The Biblical Commission, re-echoing the tradition of all Christian centuries, emphasized anew the historical character of the first three chapters of Genesis. We therefore acknowledge the exalted place which the Biblical account assigns to man in the scale of creation. Man alone is said to be made in the image and likeness of God.\* There is no doubt that God intended this likeness to consist in the possession by man of a spiritual and rational soul.

Yet we have seen that those who follow these directions are in good company. And scientists who have helped to establish the conclusions referred to have, perhaps unknown to themselves, taken the Catholic approach in their interpretations of the data of anthropology.

\* Genesis, 1:26, 27.



## Methods of Procedure in Securing Distributive Justice

ELIGIUS WEIR, O.F.M.

Crime is a problem because man has made it so. To benefit his individual interests, he has dealt with all matters embraced by criminology in a manner which has resulted in confusion. Pride, Avarice, Lust, Anger, Gluttony, Envy, and Sloth, the predominant passions which, when uncontrolled, are the dominant causes of crime — also, are the forces which have brought failure to man's methods of effecting a cure for his fellow man.

Man says that he wishes to solve the crime problem. He points to the huge sums of money he has expended in costly projects and to the superficial results of his labors, yet, he is no closer to the solution today than he was centuries ago. He has effected many changes for the better only because the forces of the Christian civilization insisted that he do so, or because he saw therein an opportunity to better his personal situation. So complicated has man made the crime problem to himself and his fellow man, that, boast though he does of his progress, the truth is, the problem is static, and man knows it not, or knowing, will not acknowledge it. There is no point to pulling punches in matters of Truth. Man's ethics have been damnable, his vagaries have been destructive, and his theories, most of them, have been abominable.

Yet, how simple would this problem be if man would but put into practice the principles of Christian morals. The Church always has had the solution to man's social problems. Crime is a social problem. But, why have not those of our Faith applied the teachings of the Church when they have had the opportunity to do so? Consider the benefits to society if all our so-called Catholic laymen in governmental and public office would conduct themselves and act according to Christian ethics. The answer as to why many do not is simple. They are interested primarily in themselves. There are many Catholics in name, not in practice, in high places who use the good name of the Church to further their personal ambitions. We have had enough of man's selfishness. It is time for Action. Call

it Catholic Action if you will. I welcome all who will join me in a national program of criminological research and public education.

The Catholic sociologist is exceptionally well-equipped for the program in mind, for not only has he the knowledge of his science, but also sound social philosophy. He is able to bring spiritual and ethical values into his research, and in matters of education he has Truth to disseminate.

Some outstanding faults of the profession are responsible for the existence of many social evils. These faults should be mentioned. There is, for instance, the tendency to waste valuable time discovering and elaborating on matters which already are well known and obvious. Then, too, there is the failure to convert scientific data into educational material that can be understood by the masses. Some sociologists even attempt to confound by terminology common to the profession in order to set themselves apart and above those who listen to and read them. Opportunities thus are lost to educate others. Finally, research findings often are made known only to the profession, to the exclusion of the public. The importance of having a well-informed society behind a proper corrective measure pointed out by the sociologist is easily recognized. Sociology is the science of society, and it is the duty of the sociologist to combat false education. When he does not speak outside of his profession, half-truths, misinformation, and the mass psychology practiced by those who are inimical to the interests of the people, work evil. In my opinion, the work of sociologists will be of little import until they have established *en rapport* with the public. Their counsel will be accepted only when that has been accomplished.

As long as free speech is permissible in this country, the lecture platform will be available to the sociologist. There is nothing to prevent him from organizing study groups, or from instructing civic clubs and societies in his community on social problems. It is regrettable that the media which reach large numbers of the masses, i. e., the movies, radio, and press, prefer to present the sensational features of our social problems, particularly crime, instead of those of educational value. We can only hope that the management of some one of the media mentioned someday will set an example for the others and thereby render a great public service. Crime, for instance, can be made exceedingly interesting from an educational standpoint. Certainly, we who are engaged in criminological research could supply a quantity of authentic information. The completed projects and



those in progress in my laboratory alone would keep any one of the media referred to occupied for several years with the subjects embraced by criminology.

Criminological research today is concerned with crime, criminals, rehabilitation, parole, and social readjustment. Both Catholic and non-Catholic sociologists have studied these from a scientific angle that has reached its effective limit, or at least, sufficiently to leave little unknown of scientific importance. This may not be apparent to some. The limits of science in this field do not place any limitations upon the work of the Catholic sociologist. Had he not interwoven spiritual and ethical values into his scientific research, he, too, would be finished. Because he has done so, however, it is possible for him to formulate constructive and practical programs of vital importance to all, and in which his active help to execute them is necessary. In particular is the work of the Catholic sociologist of value to educators, who are the only logical profession to direct a program of rehabilitation, because religious instruction and the training of the will to self-control over evil inclinations is the fundamental basis of such a project.

The value of religion and of science in the rehabilitation of prisoners has inspired much controversial material. Science alone has not, and cannot rehabilitate prisoners. Religion can and has accomplished that objective as history testifies. Science can, however, offer religion many aids in the work of rehabilitating men for society.

Science in the rehabilitation of prisoners may hold a very important place. Science diagnoses and types the individual according to his environmental background, extent of criminality, personality, intelligence, educational and vocational attainment, potential possibilities, resources, degree of improvability, and offers a preliminary prognostication for his future social readjustment. Science then segregates and re-segregates the prisoner until he becomes one of a group with whom the educators work. Naturally, there are many groups, and because each has a different classification due to the kind of individuals therein, various techniques of instruction have to be employed. Science sets the stage for individualized treatment.

Religion takes the individual in the group provided by science (regardless of his degree of tractability and improvability), and helps him develop his intellect to habits of right thinking and his will to proper conduct. Religion provides a program of training toward a threefold end, which is: Development of a good personality; de-



velopment of intellect; and training of a will to exercise self-control over evil inclinations. For a full discussion of science and religion in the rehabilitation of prisoners, I refer you to the November, 1940, issue of the *Ecclesiastical Review*, in which this subject has been covered in detail.

There is a phase of criminological research which has been given but little consideration by sociologists and criminologists. That is the matter of distributive justice. It constitutes the greatest impediment to rehabilitative efforts because of its ill effects on the minds of the subjects. At present we can hope to rehabilitate small numbers, but no rehabilitation program will succeed for the majority until the distribution of justice is in accordance with Christian ethics. Since the specific rôles of science and religion in rehabilitation work are known, and since we have the solution to the crime problem, let us direct our efforts toward correcting the only real menace to progress. Injustices committed by agencies of society were largely responsible for an embittered feeling toward it, and a failure to make an effort to reform on the part of some individuals always has been apparent. It was not until a project begun in 1938, and which I do not expect to complete before 1950, proved conclusively, even in its early stages, that the lack of Christian morals on the part of society in dealing with crime and the criminal is the really big issue.

In 1937 the attention of the nation was directed to the parole system by the press because of the wanton acts of a few parolees, who, incidentally, were not representative of the large numbers on parole. Hundreds of deserving men in our prisons were ill-affected by that episode. I determined at that time to launch a project which would bring every conceivable angle of the crime problem to light, and which would settle a number of things for time to come. Furthermore, I determined to give the public the results of this research. This I am doing at every opportunity. To discuss the project is a subject in itself; but many of the findings which have resulted thus far are presented in a textbook on Criminology and Penology which has just been published.

Before evils can be corrected, they must be thoroughly studied. Distributive justice cannot be effected before the sociologist and criminologist have laid the groundwork in research that deals specifically with the following matters:

1. An examination of the ethics of all our crime-combating agencies, sparing no group or individual.

2. A thorough study of the criminal laws of every state, their application, and their effect.
3. A searching examination of the parole system and the administration of parole of every state.
4. A detailed study of parole supervision, also on a national scale.

From the data compiled by sociologists who participate in the project, each in his own community and state, practical programs will emanate which will be concerned with:

1. Christian morals in our crime-combating agencies.
2. National standardization and codification of criminal laws.
3. National standardization of parole systems and the administration of parole.
4. National standardization of parole supervision.

The movement to secure distributive justice in all criminal matters must proceed in the paths mentioned, and toward the ultimate goals just determined. Research would be wasted effort in any other direction. Moreover, the correction of an evil in one state is impossible without a similar correction in all, for crime recognizes no state boundaries. Therefore, the project must be national in its scope.

The Criminological Research Laboratory, and the Institute for the Scientific Study of Crime, of which I am the director, will be pleased to give counsel relative to the detailed methods now being employed in the study begun in 1938. With the cooperation of local groups and communities, we could be able to secure findings for a national compilation.

In conclusion may I stress the necessity of prying into the activities of those agencies which are supposed to be correcting crime, but which in reality because of their unethical principles, not necessarily malicious, are not even scratching the surface of the crime problem. With the data of science on hand, together with that which we can easily obtain, without any great effort, we can effect a set-up along the lines of Christian morals that will greatly diminish crime even though it will not completely destroy it. The public properly educated by those who have the correct knowledge will demand an application of our methods which are based on solid principles and on proved scientific data.

## **Undergraduate Preparation for Social Work**

SISTER ELIZABETH FRANCES

Since social work is now regarded as a profession requiring graduate study, it follows, as it does in medicine and in law, that there must be certain prerequisites in the curriculum on an undergraduate level. According to a recent (1937) statement of policy of the American Association of Schools of Social Work drawn up by the Curriculum Committee on Pre-Requisites for Admission to Member Schools the pre-requisites most closely related to professional curricula are economics, political science, psychology and sociology (including social anthropology). The Report recommended that undergraduate colleges adopt a similar curriculum for students contemplating graduate study in the applied social sciences and that these subjects be recognized as pre-professional in character after October 1, 1939. The report also stated that the Association recognizes the value of courses in biology, history, English literature and composition, as well as of others contributing to a broad cultural background.

Another point emphasized in the Report is the fact that the concept of social work is rapidly changing, owing to the ever increasing attention which is being given to the public welfare field. If this was true in 1937, the date of the report, it is only more true in 1940. Today, the term, "social work," does not necessarily connote skill in case work only, but rather envisions a clear understanding of the philosophies behind social welfare with its many ramifications in public as well as in private fields of endeavor. Therefore, the need of emphasis on the study of the social sciences in undergraduate work as an adequate preparation for more intensive study in graduate schools is more imperative than it ever was before.

In order to acquire the broad cultural background which will be demanded of Catholic social workers, it is essential that these embryonic workers be given the maximum instruction in religion, Catholic philosophy, psychology and ethics as well as other basic studies, such as logic, history, further study in a foreign language, and several courses in English. Surely, such a foundation ought to give them a deep appreciation for the work of the Church in the

past and imbue them with Catholic principles and a philosophy which they know has witnessed the test of time.

We agree with the Association's Report that biology should be a required science for such students so that they will have the proper foundation of accurate knowledge upon which to base further study in subjects closely correlated with biology, such as physiology and public health which are given later in our course. Whether students majoring in sociology choose their field of concentration in sophomore or junior year matters not, provided the proper sequence in the social sciences is observed. With the required thirty hours in the major subject of sociology, it is also necessary to carry a related subject in the social sciences so that at the end of the course the student has a rounded knowledge in the social sciences. We also believe that a course in statistics is very much worthwhile, both for its disciplinary value and as a tool in the field of research which may interest some students as they progress toward their graduate work.

It is generally agreed that the approach to sociology is necessarily theoretical with no alloy of social pathology in the early courses. First, there must be a thorough grounding in principles and philosophies to which they as Catholic social workers cannot subscribe. A study of social theories both past and present may follow with the proper evaluation from a Catholic point of view and a just appreciation of the contribution made to social work by Catholic philosophers, an appreciation which is sadly lacking in so many of our courses in social theory.

We believe that it is well for economics to be given in conjunction with these theoretical courses in sociology and so prescribe this part of the social science curricula for twelve semester hours. These courses in economics are given by a Catholic layman, a graduate of Harvard, and well known in educational circles.

With this foundation, we proceed to a study of the application of the principles learned. A general course is given in social problems with particular emphasis on those of the child in the secondary semester. This course in pathology is in no way technical, but rather such as would prepare for teaching, social work or future motherhood. In the weekly reading assignments care is taken to see that the students become acquainted with leading authorities in the field, both Catholic and non-Catholic. Since many of our students are not able to continue their formal education beyond that of the A. B.

degree, we think that it is necessary to train them to think intelligently on these social questions which are so important today.

Here might be outlined our plan of field practice which throughout the course is entirely extra-curricular and voluntary. Its purpose is merely that of orientation on a pre-professional basis with no accompanying technical courses. The program has been carefully organized in regard to the kind of work offered and as to the types of students selected for the work. In sophomore and junior years, our students are given the opportunity of offering their services in our Catholic settlement houses where, under the guidance of the Sisters, they obtain experience in group work; and more important still, have the opportunity of observing Catholic ideals in practice.

In senior year our sociology majors are placed in agencies, both public and private, where, for one day a week, they receive whatever experience it is expedient for the agency to give. In other words, we do not expect the same amount of attention as is given to graduate schools who are spending full time in the same agencies. The interest shown in our students by the agencies, however, is most gratifying and encouraging. The students are trained to realize that this field work is a privilege for them as undergraduates and that the continuance of the policy rests with them. Consequently, we are told that they show an appreciative attitude towards their work and a willingness to be of service, no matter what the type of service may be. This field work is merely introductory and not in any way professional in character. We have used many types of service offered to us by the Boston agencies. In this way a view of the whole field is given to the seniors so that they may be better able to formulate some idea as to their choice of specialization for graduate study.

In this field work set-up, the students are carefully supervised and guided by two Catholic laywomen, members of the American Association of Social Workers. One, a recognized social work executive in Boston, carefully plans the program. The other visits the agencies once a semester and confers weekly with the students. Thus a close contact is kept between the agency and the College. In making each assignment, the temperament and ability of the students are carefully considered, but if the choice is not satisfactory, as is sometimes discovered by the field supervisor, a change is made.

For many reasons this undergraduate field practice is most helpful to the student of social science. First, it is a phase of Catholic action which often results in future leadership. After their contacts

with the underprivileged our students have a more sympathetic and intelligent understanding of the social problems confronting the nation and the Church. It is bound to carry over into their lives whether they enter the professional field or not. We know of many instances where such leadership in parish activities or civic undertakings has resulted from this actual experience.

Secondly, if, as is true, the majority of our students who have shown an aptitude for working with people cannot afford graduate training, it is only fair to give them as much experience as is possible in their chosen field. The physical scientist must know his theory, but also his laboratory. So, too, with the social scientist whose laboratory is life and its problems.

Thirdly, this field practice, as remote training for social work, has worked out advantageously both for the student who has gone to graduate school and for the one who has not. An instance may illustrate our point. One of our students was placed in a difficult agency where the standards were high and the work of a very responsible nature. At first she found it trying and contemplated a change of assignment but decided to wait until the semester finished. By this time she had adjusted and was quite satisfied with the work. Upon entering graduate school her first assignment in family case work was also in a private agency which required maturity among other qualities. She made the adjustment easily and was taken on for temporary work during the summer before returning to graduate school. We feel certain, knowing the immature girl with whom we were dealing, that this student would not have been so successful if she had not had some of her "growing pains" under our supervision.

In another case a good student, but one who was financially unable to attend graduate school, was assigned to a private agency. In the course of the year the fine caliber of her work was observed by the supervisor who became interested in the girl. It so happened that this supervisor was in a position to obtain a year's scholarship from available funds for our student to attend a near-by graduate school of social work. The student lived up to our expectations and was given a temporary summer position with the same agency at the end of which time she was given a second scholarship in order to finish her course.

Again, in some cases, it has been the policy of private agencies who are more free in the choice of their personnel than public agen-

cies to select our most promising undergraduates and train them as they wish. This has happened in several instances, and the results are satisfactory.

In regard to public agencies, the students have found the experience invaluable and it has often resulted in later appointments after further study and experience.

Therefore, for these various reasons, we believe that there is a definite place for undergraduate field practice when given merely as an introduction to social work or for a more intelligent participation in life.

Side by side with the field practice in senior year is a further introduction into the active side of social work by means of the various courses. The public welfare aspect, because of its ever increasing importance, is stressed from many angles, including current legislation, health measures, and policies of administration. Under the able direction of one of our priests, a graduate of the School of Social Work of the Catholic University, the students receive the most recent information available in this field. At the same time, the principles of political science, so necessary as a background for an intelligent understanding of social legislation, are given by a Catholic layman, a graduate of Harvard. Much time also is devoted to generic social case work through the reading and discussion of current thought as found in recent literature. In addition, a series of weekly lectures by leaders from public and private agencies in Boston is offered, so that the students may have a better perspective of the entire field of social work.

We believe that such an undergraduate course with emphasis on the social sciences lays a foundation upon which further study or training may adequately be placed.

As a preparation for social work, it arouses and strengthens an interest and enthusiasm for the work which very often leads to graduate study in a professional school of social work. Apart from this, it gives young women a broader and more intelligent understanding of the problems facing the world today and awakens in them a sense of responsibility which urges them to take their place in the world as truly cultured and active Catholic young women.



## NEWS OF SOCIOLOGICAL INTEREST

Convention headquarters of the American Catholic Sociological Society will be in the Hotel Astor, New York City. As previously announced, the fourth annual convention will open Sunday morning, December 28, and close Tuesday afternoon, December 30. Sessions will be devoted to a consideration of the following topics: rural sociology, sociology and public welfare, criminology, the family in contemporary society, race and race relations, social processes and sociology, research in sociology, labor problems, social theory, contemporary social movements, curriculum of college sociology, and sociology in the high school.

There will be special round table discussions, a student session on Monday, December 29, and two luncheon meetings on the 29th and 30th. Groups desiring to hold special meetings during the convention should make such arrangements with Walter L. Willigan of the Department of Social Sciences, St. John's University, Brooklyn, who is chairman of the arrangements committee.

The December issue of the *AMERICAN CATHOLIC SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW* will carry a complete program for the three days.



The National Catholic Rural Life Conference held its nineteenth annual convention in Jefferson City, Missouri, October 4-8. Each day of the convention was set aside for some special group or topic, leaders, church and nation, discussion, farmers, and youth. The convention meetings were well represented with ACSS members on the program. The Rev. Joseph P. Donovan, C.M., of Kenrick Seminary, the Rev. Joseph Fichter, S.J., St. Mary's College (Kansas), and the Rev. John C. Rawe, S.J., Emerson Hynes, St. John's University (Minn.), Johann Mokre, St. Louis University, Most Rev. Aloisius J. Muench, Bishop of Fargo, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Luigi Ligutti of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference, Rev. Gilbert Wolters, O.S.B., St. Benedict's College, Alphonse Clemens, Fontbonne College, all members of the ACSS, were on the program.

The Most Rev. Aloisius Muench, Bishop of Fargo, N.D., and a member of the ACSS, was elected to the presidency of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference.



The Thirty-Sixth Annual Meeting of the National Conference of Catholic Charities will open formally in Houston, Texas, on October 19. The convention will be preceded by two days of preliminary meetings for religious and diocesan directors. Some of the members of the ACSS who are on the program: the Rev. Elmer Barton, S.J., Loyola University (Chicago), will act as discussion leader at a round table meeting of the Committee on Families; Sister M. Paulette of Nazareth College will read a paper on "The Sisterhoods and Social Service"; the Rev. Walter McGuinn, S.J., will give a paper on "Selective Service and Family Life"; the Rt. Rev. Luigi Ligutti of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference will read a paper on "Farm Migration and Rural Life."



The Editor of the REVIEW would appreciate information concerning labor schools under the sponsorship of Catholic Institutions and organizations. New York reports indicate the existence of three such evening schools this year: the Xavier Free Labor School in Manhattan attached to St. Francis Xavier Parish; the Crown Heights Labor School at the Brooklyn Prep School; and the Workers' School of the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists whose faculty is composed of Fordham University faculty and archdiocesan priests.



The Social Science Research Council is offering for the academic year 1942-43 Post-Doctoral research training fellowships, Pre-Doctoral field fellowships, and grants-in-aid of research in the social sciences. The work may be done in economics, economic and political history, political science, social psychology, sociology, cultural anthropology, statistics, and social aspects of related disciplines. Information concerning awards may be had from the Secretary for Fellowships and Grants-in-Aid, Laura Barrett, 230 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.



The Bureau of Census of the Department of Commerce is at present engaged in the task of assembling the results of the Sixteenth Decennial Census. The bureau has issued a number of tentative lists available upon request. These lists include the publications which will result from the census. Some of the fields are: population, housing, agriculture, manufactures, business, and mineral industries.



This year two Jesuit sociologists at St. Louis University, pioneers among Catholics in the development of Catholic social thought in America, celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of their entrance into the Society of Jesus. They are the Rev. Joseph C. Husslein, S.J., professor of social work, and the Rev. Albert Muntsch, S.J., professor of sociology.

A new high school text by Eva J. Ross, Trinity College, *Sound Social Living* made its appearance on October 1. Miss Ross served as "advisor on cooperative undertakings at the Fifth Quinquennial National Congress of the Third Order of St. Francis held in Pittsburgh, October 11-13.



Melvin J. Williams, a Methodist minister, formerly an assistant in the department of sociology at Duke University, now instructor at Albion College, Michigan, has written an interesting Ph.D. dissertation under C. Ellwood, *A Survey of Roman Catholic Sociological Theory Since 1900*.



*Social Life of Primitive Man*, a textbook presenting the theories and findings of the Vienna "cultural-historical school" of anthropology, written by the Rev. Sylvester A. Sieber, S.V.D., and Franz Mueller of the College of St. Thomas, is now available through the Herder Book Co.



Regional meetings of the Catholic Conference on Industrial Problems will be held in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, October 28-29, and in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, December 1-2. Further information can be secured by writing to the Social Action Department of the N.C.W.C.



Sister M. Electa, O.S.B., has resumed teaching at the College of St. Scholastica after having obtained a Master's degree at the Catholic University. Sister M. Gerard, O.S.B., is pursuing graduate studies in the department of sociology at the University of Minnesota.



ACSS members, Eva J. Ross, Johann Mokre, Emerson Hynes, Franz Mueller, John C. Rawe, S.J., Martin Schirber, O.S.B., and Monsignor Luigi Ligutti, took part in the Rural Life School held at St. John's University this summer.



John J. Cronin, member of the Social Work Department at the University of Notre Dame, has assumed the position of Director of the School of Social Administration at the University of Louisville.



Sister Mary Canisia, S.S.N.D., of Mount Mary College, Milwaukee, was elected to the executive board of the National Catholic Conference on Family Life.

Andrew J. Kress of Georgetown University and the Rev. Edgar Schmiedeler, O.S.B., of the N.C.W.C. are bringing out a textbook entitled "Normative Sociology for Secondary Schools."

★

The Rev. Bernard J. Mulvaney, C.S.V., has been appointed instructor in the department of sociology at the Catholic University of America.

★

W. B. Saunders Company has just published *Sociology and Social Problems in Nursing Service* by Gladys Sellow, assistant professor in sociology at Catholic University.

★

The fourth annual meeting of the National Conference on Family Relations will be held in New York, December 29-31, 1941. The general topic for the meeting will be "Family Preparedness."

★

Reports indicate that the University of Notre Dame Centennial program in 1942 will include the meetings of a number of learned societies in the social sciences.

★

The Annual Institute of the Child Study Association of America will be held in New York City, November 14-15. The Theme will be "Family Morale in a World at War."

★

Frank Itzin, formerly Assistant Statistician of the Indiana State Department of Public Welfare, has joined the faculty of the St. Louis University School of Social Service.

★

Walter L. Willigan, chairman of the department of social sciences at St. John's University, represented the ACSS at the Fordham University Centenary Celebration in September.

## BOOK REVIEWS

PAUL J. MUNDIE, Book Review Editor  
Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

*Helping Youth to Grow.* By Joseph G. Kempf. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co. 1941. Pp. xi + 204. \$2.00

This little book is addressed to "parents, teachers, and priests, who have to deal with adolescent boys and girls." In thirteen chapters the author discusses the general question of the relation of the older and the younger generation and also such specific issues as stealing, cheating, scruples, crushes, purity, marriage, and vocation. There is little which is original either in the material or the presentation; but the facts are retold sanely, clearly, interestingly, and with good humor. The author, who is a priest and a Doctor of Philosophy, shows a broad acquaintance with both the theological and the scientific literature of his subject. Better still, one feels at once that he is a kindly, understanding sort of person who can meet young people on their own ground and discuss their problems with sympathy but without sentimentality.

It is rather surprising to find a book on youth written by a professor of sociology and published in 1941 which so completely neglects the social question. Young people today are generally pretty much excited over such things as war, unemployment, poverty, Communism, Fascism, race relations. They feel the impact of these things on their own lives, and they have a keen intellectual interest in them so far as they affect the lives of others. The European youth movement has had an enormous effect both for better and for worse, while in America a genuine youth movement is quickly taking shape. Yet this book moves in a cloistered atmosphere where social problems apparently do not exist. There is a whole chapter on cheating in school, but practically nothing on the vital issues of the day which so stir the spirit of youth. This makes the whole treatment more than a little unreal. The reviewer's face is red as he makes this criticism; for he published a very similar book twelve years ago which made a very similar mistake. Still, a lot of things have happened in those twelve years!

PAUL HANLY FURFEY

*Catholic University of America*

*Educational Sociology.* By Frederick E. Bolton and John E. Corbally. New York: American Book Company. 1941. Pp. xvi + 632. \$3.00

A new textbook in educational sociology which devotes nearly a hundred pages to observations on "Democracy and Education" is sure to find a welcome today. The chief merit of this book over any of its predecessors lies in its comprehensiveness. The two chapters on the relation of the Federal Government to education and the chapter on the National Educational Association extend the scope of the book beyond that of previous texts. In the treatment of various types of education such as adult and vocational education it goes into considerable detail, and the problems of guidance and of the social life of the school, in the estimation of the authors themselves, receive greater emphasis in this volume than they do in most textbooks. But workers' education as conducted in the Wisconsin School for Workers and in our own Labor Schools seems to have been overlooked.

One is apt to ask himself, in reviewing a book like this, whether educational sociology offers a distinct and promising area of investigation, and if it does, whether it pertains primarily to the field of education or to the field of sociology. No one can question the first-rank importance of the educational process in the life of society. We may recall that neither Aristotle nor Plato could write at length about politics (which was as close as the ancients came to sociology) without going into a full-dress discussion of the function of education in promoting a just, satisfactory social order. In our day and land Dr. John Dewey has underscored the social function of education. "Men live in community in virtue of the things they have in common: and communication is the way in which they come to possess things in common. . . . Not only is social life identical with communication, but all communication (and hence all genuine social life) is educative . . . not only does social life demand teaching and learning for its own permanence, but the very process of living together educates" (*Democracy and Education*, pp. 5-7). Society has a more metaphysical basis than communication, but Dr. Dewey has brought to the fore a most important truth. The difficulty lies in setting boundaries to the field of education. If we are to include under that process all the formal and informal, personal and impersonal, agencies of communication, and if communication and social activity are well-nigh synonymous, then the term "educational" as descriptive of sociology becomes, not a departmentalizing epithet, but a description of an approach to the whole science of sociology, on a par with the psychological or the cultural or the philosophical or other approaches. It becomes scarcely less than a point of view from which to study sociology.

Professors Bolton and Corbally hardly mean to do that. But they cannot or at least do not avoid touching on nearly all the institutions and problems falling within the scope of sociology proper —

the school, the home, religion, the state, society; population; crime; recreation. It cannot be said that they give their treatment a particularly sociological form, as have Snedden and Finney. Being professors of education, they handle these topics descriptively rather than sociologically. The result is that they have not defined their scope with any clarity, never define education or sociology with any precision, and fail to give to terms like "society" and especially "democracy" any satisfactory meaning.

The student of this field would do well to analyze a book like this in the light of Albert Jay Nock's *The Theory of Education in the United States*. Mr. Nock subjects to a very intelligent criticism three ideas underlying the current brand of educational sociology, namely, the zeal for "equality," the inaccurate bandying about of the concept "democracy," and the assumption that a literate citizenry offers a guarantee of good government. Professors Bolton and Corbally very honestly face the failure of the public school to diminish crime. But they are not equally wary in favoring the extension of federal activity in education for the purpose of equalizing opportunities in education. What need is there to equalize schools all over the country, unless the communities and everybody living in them are to be equalized into one huge everybody's-the-same tract of undifferentiated mass-produced America? Not equality, but a *proportionate opportunity* is what social justice requires. New York will always have better schools than Paducah; that will be true so long as New York remains New York and Paducah remains Paducah. We have to choose between pulverizing the country into a meaningless mass, or retaining a differentiated, hierarchic structure of society with too great differences modified by co-operation, effected where necessary by Federal funds, but not by Federal officials. Why? Because social justice requires a proportionate distribution of goods, not an equal distribution. Aristotle saw that, and the encyclicals of Popes Leo XIII and Pius XI have given the highest authority to the whole scholastic tradition on this point.

Except in one place (p. 125) the authors make education too exclusively social. Unravel the skein of human relationships anywhere you wish and you will find the twilled strands of *individual* and *social* interests. The ultimate value of the human personality is rooted in the *non omnis moriar* of man's spirit. His understanding is his, unique. His will is his, unique. His imagination, his emotional responses, are all his, no other's. In a sense the individual stands wonderfully alone. For ultimate success or ultimate failure is his, personally. And education must take him as he is, develop in him the capacities for both individual and social action he possesses, and thus prepare him — not merely to fit into or even improve temporal social institutions — but, in the words of Pope Pius XI, "for what he must be and for what he must do here below, in order to attain the sublime end for which he was created." For this reason he insists

that  
to m  
"indiv  
living  
Corb  
stand  
societ  
Spiri  
fluenc  
what  
write  
is dif  
T  
The  
gists.  
Studi  
T  
But a  
of T  
regar  
rather  
comin  
amou  
cy" o  
tion.  
A  
teach  
Xavi  
New  
"  
of th  
gists.  
inter  
or so  
suffici  
a coo  
corpo  
T  
place  
cept  
throu  
any C

that "there can be no true education which is not wholly directed to man's last end" (*The Christian Education of Youth*).

"What he must be and do here below" is live a life at once individual and social in its interests and responsibilities, but the man living that life is an individual personality. Professors Bolton and Corbally in the book under review reveal no philosophical understanding of the supereminent value of the individual in a Christian society, "le personnalisme chrétien" expounded by Gilson in *The Spirit of Medieval Philosophy*. In describing the educational influence of the home and of religion they do manage to improve somewhat upon the blurred thinking commonly exhibited by American writers on education and sociology. But the whole tenor of the book is diffuse, indiscriminating, indeterminate on the fundamentals.

The first two-thirds of the volume contains much useful data. The analysis of the school population especially will interest sociologists. But the last section on "The Social Value of Some School Studies" advocates a "Rugg-ed socialization" of the curriculum.

The text might serve its purpose in a secular course in education. But as the tendency seems to be, in the words of the Editor-in-Chief of *The Journal of Educational Sociology*, Dean Payne, "towards regarding educational sociology as belonging to the field of sociology rather than to education," it appears only fair to point out the shortcomings of the text from the point of view of sound sociology. No amount of well-intentioned but vague desire to "educate for democracy" can take the place of a valid philosophy of man, of his education, and of his political and social well-being.

And is everything, from teaching a child to brush his teeth to teaching him dry cleaning, *education*?

ROBERT C. HARTNETT, S.J.

*Xavier University*

*New Social Horizons*. By Seba Eldridge. New York: D. Appleton-Century Co., 1941. Pp. ix + 444. \$4.00

"The implementation of the good life" is apparently the theme of this volume written by one of America's most eminent sociologists. He draws upon an unusually rich background to establish interestingly and impressively that human experience, individual or social, can not be segregated into compartments of behavior, each sufficient to itself regardless of the conduct of others. He proposes a cooperative society, a proposal that at times seems to approach the corporative ideal.

The discussion is weakest in its conception of religion and its place in society; it is faulty, too, in its "folkways and mores" concept of ethics. There is some hedging on the basic implications through the use of qualifying phrases; but it is hard to see how any Christian, Catholic or non-Catholic, can agree with these phases



of an otherwise excellent discussion. Let the author speak for himself:

"These considerations may point to one all-embracing generalization, namely, that the process of socialization and its primary factors are governed by the culture pattern as a whole, and more particularly by the political folkways and mores. If this is true, each national state is largely a law unto itself in this matter" (p. 159).

"Perpetuation of the church as an institution is partly due to cultural inertia" (p. 126).

"These suggestions point toward a religion progressively secular in outlook. . . ." (p. 379).

"Advanced theologians commonly assume that a God must be postulated if religious values are to be realized. But this is surely a mistake. These values may be made available to those who reject that postulate, or who do not think in theological terms at all!" (p. 380)

In a chapter entitled "The Challenge to Democracy," three oligarchical powers are listed as threatening to overthrow our democratic institutions; namely, the business oligarchy, instanced by the Rockefellers, Vanderbilts, and Whitneys; the political oligarchy, represented by Hague, Curley, and McNutt machines; and the oligarchy of the press, radio, and movie. There is then attached a footnote, as follows: "Ranking with these three powers as an antidemocratic force, in the opinion of some observers, is the Catholic hierarchy which, it is said, not only promotes reactionary policies in domestic and international affairs but attempts, often with success, to suppress the civil liberties of its critics" (p. 253).

These quotations manifest serious failure to understand the part religion and morality play in human lives; and this grave failure undermines confidence in the validity of the remainder of the thesis.

F. W. GROSE

*Notre Dame College*

*Introductory Sociology.* By Edward Gregory and Lee Bidgood. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1939. Pp. xxvii + 653. \$3.50

This book undertakes to present an integrated treatment of what the authors consider the "fundamental principles" of sociology. As far as possible, the authors have attempted to illustrate these "principles" from the cultural setting which is generally common to beginners in sociology.

With the exception of a few chapters toward the end of the book, this work is designed on the lines of a survey course which provides a quick glimpse at the various subjects contained in the generally accepted field of sociology. The integration of these forces

and societal institutions which are presented is very successful. This qualification is necessary because of the fact that the Catholic sociologist cannot help but note the omission of several forces which must be considered if the formal object of sociology is man in all his social relations.

While in many places the work is a compilation of the opinions of accepted authors, it is not merely such. The authors show a commendable caution and critical faculty in their judgment of the opinions of the authorities.

The make-up of the book is excellent. At the end of each chapter there is an excellent series of questions which cover the whole matter of the preceding chapter, together with a reference list. However, one must note the absence of any Catholic authors from this list. There is an excellent index.

The book is well written. A few of the definitions, however, fail to distinguish the term defined from all other things. This is easily forgiven in sociology. Among the chapters which may be singled out for their excellence is the chapter on Contact and Interaction, with the exception of the section on Suggestion where the philosophy is that of Behaviorism. If we discount the philosophy and examine merely the analysis of the mechanics of society, the chapter on Society and the Group is exceptionally well done.

Following the Sumnerian concept of mores and folkways, there is a very clear exposition of the growth of social institutions. However, this doctrine becomes quite offensive when it is allowed to extend to include the evolution of the Natural Law and the primary precepts which proceed from the Natural Law.

The treatment of Culture, though in many ways very satisfactory, is to a certain extent, vitiated by the absence of a severely critical analysis of the various theories on the origin of culture. Ambiguous statements such as, "Culture is the factor that differentiates man from animals. Animals are social, but they are not cultural even though many of them live in communities and manifest strikingly social traits," do not enhance the value of the chapter.

In their treatment of Population and the Human Community, the authors seem to follow McKenzie, Park and Burgess perhaps a bit too closely, accepting both fact and speculation at equal value.

Part III on The Family contains a very commendable presentation of the theories of the origin of the family as proposed by Morgan, McLennan, Westermarck, Briffault, Bachofen and Sir Henry Maine. True to the philosophy of positivism in their criticism of these theories, the criticisms of the authors are purely materialistic or naturalistic. Catholics will object to the acceptance of Groves as an authority on family relationships.

The authors are guilty of historical and doctrinal inaccuracy in a very confused paragraph in this section in which they attribute very strange ideas to St. Paul, and doctrines of anti-marriage which

were expressly condemned as heretical to the early church. These so-called facts are not documented except by references to Groves who can scarcely qualify as an authority on the teachings of the Church. Otherwise the treatment of this subject is adequate.

From a scientific viewpoint the treatment of Race and Culture Contacts is outstanding for a book of this type.

One might question the inclusion of separate chapters on the Mountaineers, the American Indians, Orientals and Mexicans and Negroes in a book of this type. However, these sections are interesting, informative and provocative. A peculiar frame of mind with regard to the Negro might be pointed out. The authors seem to infer that the Negro more freely accepted the lower economic and social position than the whites.

In the section devoted to Social Problems may be found a factually excellent treatment of poverty and dependency. However, one notes the advocacy of sterilization of the so-called socially unfit, the lack of any consideration of the fundamental basis of justice and an almost complete acceptance of mere probable opinion on the inheritance of defects and disease.

Crime and Delinquency receives its proportionate space in a clear and analytic treatment. This section suffers from a very basic fault common to most sociology texts, the omission of concupiscence as a very fundamental force in the motivation of human conduct.

Part VII on Social Control and Social Change is rather well done if one allows for the low place accorded to basic and concrete ethical and religious forces and motives in human conduct.

This book has been a very difficult book to evaluate because, on the one hand, the book is outstanding for its clarity, its fair-mindedness and its logical presentation of facts. However, the basic underlying philosophy of the book is Comte's positivism mixed with relativism in morals and pure utilitarianism and therefore will not be acceptable to the scientific Catholic philosopher on that score. The book could probably be used in a Catholic College, but the professor is warned that he will have to make quite a few corrections in the social philosophy on which the book is founded. Also, in this book he will find no nearly adequate description of the social program or the social work of the Catholic Church.

The reader of this work will be somewhat the victim of regrets. It is distinctly a matter of regret that a great amount of well-marshalled and well written material loses a good deal of its effectiveness in interpretation. All social forces and phenomena must be interpreted in terms of philosophical belief and religion. Unfortunately the authors have chosen to interpret social forces and social phenomena in terms of positivism which has failed to meet the test of either time or experience, and which, in the opinion of this reviewer is a positive danger to the indiscriminating and uncritical college student. There is herein contained a definite challenge to all sociologists, but especially to the Catholic sociologist to take such

excellent material and interpret it in the light of the philosophia perennis, and bring these conclusions to a world which eagerly awaits true help. In other words, religion and objective, universal ethical norms must be considered in any study of man and society.

HUBERT C. CALLAGHAN, S.J.

*Holy Cross College*

*A Socio-Economic Survey of the Marshdwellers of Four South-eastern Louisiana Parishes.* By Edward J. Kammer, C.M. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press. 1941

One conversant with literature and literary processes is reported to have said that he found doctoral dissertations about as interesting as mail-order house catalogues, definitely implying that they are not interesting. This is decidedly untrue if applied to Father Kammer's study of the designated Louisiana marshdwellers. Here is a panorama of human culture, so to speak, of people whose lives lie economically in the most primitive era of culture, who earn their living by hunting and fishing under circumstances which do not favor, or indeed even permit the adoption of less primitive modes of living. When the game season is over, these families migrate to their permanent abodes and to conditions materially, but unevenly, advanced. The details of this adaptation have been presented with great fidelity.

This is a "field study" of somewhat the same technique as *Middletown*. The people studied present, however, a greater variation in culture pattern detail. In many respects these are "our contemporary ancestors," yet phenomena as "recent" as the motor, movie and radio have been cordially welcomed to their midst. There is a striking illustration of cultural adaptation in the reception which the "big oil companies" and all that they imply, have been accorded. No collection of books on sociology or cultural anthropology is complete without Father Kammer's study.

SISTER MARY LIGUORI, B.V.M.

*Mundelein College*

*Heinrich Pesch and This Theory of Christian Solidarism.* By Franz H. Mueller. St. Paul: College of St. Thomas. 1941. Pp. 50

All those who help us in the English-speaking world to arrive at an understanding and come into closer contact with the German works of Heinrich Pesch, S.J., on the Reorganization of Social Economy make valuable contributions to the cause of social reconstruction. For in the works of Heinrich Pesch, S.J., we find the systematic arrangements in social philosophy as traditionally taught in the Catholic Church.

In Aquin Paper No. 7, a well-printed booklet of fifty pages, Dr. Mueller, who studied with Father Pesch for a number of years, gives an excellent summary of solidarism, the middle road; its rejection of the road of socialism on the left, and its rejection of the road to liberalistic capitalism on the right.

In his work and writing Heinrich Pesch, S.J., was always concerned with the application of scholastic philosophy to fundamental social and economic problems. Sober facts and concrete investigations take up nine-tenths of Pesch's five-volume work on economics.

Father Pesch taught that the center of gravity of a people's economic system cannot lie in world commerce, based on some "monoculture," i. e., predominance of a certain national product, e. g., coffee in Brazil, cotton in the South, wheat in the West, concentrated industries in the Northeast. These specializations make the national economy too highly sensitive to economic crises. The center of gravity of a people's economic system must lie in the social, vocational, and intervocational organization of a balanced diversified production. The social problem today, according to Pesch, is not simply a "depression," i. e., an accidental recurring crisis. But it is an essential crisis, a crisis in the very structure of the capitalistic social system. He made it clear that the only way to have economic health, social order, etc., in an economic system is to organize it in such a way that all factors in the system; namely, agriculture, the various industries, the various trades, play their joint rights, that is in a vocational order.

*Quadragesimo Anno* takes up the practical possibilities of solidarism in the ordering of national economy.

Some think that there is a defect in Pesch's solidarism. I think the "defect" is in ourselves. And I think we could remove this "defect" in ourselves, if we had the good sense and the vision to work out the principles of solidarism in the economy of the home and the economy of the local community.

Solidarism applied to the economy of the home would mean family production of many family needs (principally foods) in productive homesteads. The homestead in the country or in the city is family solidarism applied to home production. The home on the land and family-use production gives a solidarist structure to the family.

Solidarism applied to the economy of the local community would mean using the principles of cooperation in buying and selling, in credit, in health, in insurance, etc. Cooperatives give solidarism to community life. They restore a large measure of functional organization in communities in the essential functions of buying and selling and providing services, and even in some production. A large number of cooperatives functioning in any community according to the Rochdale principles of cooperation give solidarist structure to that community.

Father Pesch worked out the philosophy of the vocational groups in the national economy. He was concerned with the principles that underlie the organization of national functional groups for the attainment of the common good with social justice and social charity. He concentrated on the organic ordering of society in the big groups. The realization of the organic ordering of society in the big groups, presupposes that there be smaller organic centers, centers of economic and social vitality, smaller groups functioning in an organic fashion. When the small organic groups in society, namely, the family units and the local community units, really function organically, then it becomes a very natural and easy step to set up the bigger organic units in society, i. e., the big vocational groups. Without organic life in the smaller organisms of society; namely, the family units and the local community units, it is natural that men should think of vocational groups as theoretical, excellent in themselves but impossible of fulfillment. Hence, Father Pesch is accused of being a theorist, a mere student, a mere speculative thinker, out of touch with reality and without a practical program.

It is my opinion that, if, while we learn Father Pesch's plan for the organic ordering of the big functional units in economics and sociology, we would be "little solidarists," i. e., builders of organic structure in the little organic units of society; namely, the family units and the local community units applying the principles of solidarism to the home and to the essential economic functions of communities, then we would advance much more quickly to a realization of the vocational groupings in the national society. And we would then find that Father Pesch is a realist, a fine practical theorist who has worked out the principles of the big solidarism for us. There is not enough solidarism in the family units and in the local community units to serve as a foundation for the organic social life that can bring into actual existence the big national vocational groups. For the Catholic leader in social reconstruction the work of Father Pesch is indispensable, but he must not allow himself to believe that the little organic units as centers of organic life, centers of renewed vitality in social and economic function, are not important.

Dr. Mueller's little booklet is a fine tribute to the scholarship of Father Pesch and a very helpful guide for Catholic leaders in social and economic thought and action.

JOHN C. RAWE, S.J.

*Institute of Social Order*

eco

of

ant

the

soci



### CONTRIBUTORS

Franz Mueller is a member of the department of sociology and economics at the College of St. Thomas, St. Paul, Minnesota.

Sister Mary Liguori, B.V.M., is chairman of the department of sociology at Mundelein College, Chicago, Illinois.

The Rev. Albert Muntsch, S.J., is professor of sociology and anthropology at St. Louis University, St. Louis, Missouri.

The Rev. Eligius Weir, O.F.M., is director of the Institute for the Scientific Study of Crime in Joliet, Illinois.

Sister Elizabeth Frances, S.S.J., chairman of the department of sociology at Regis College, Weston, Massachusetts.

★ ★ ★







